



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,218	01/02/2004	James Edwin Hanson	00280752AA	6661

30743 7590 08/01/2007
WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON & COOK, P.C.
11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD
SUITE 340
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

WON, MICHAEL YOUNG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/01/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/750,218

Applicant(s)

HANSON ET AL.

Examiner

Michael Y. Won

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the application filed January 2, 2004.
2. Claims 1-16 have been examined and are pending with this action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-11, and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Lemon et al. (US 2002/0188666).
4. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-11, and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lemon et al. (US 2002/0188666).

INDEPENDENT:

As per **claim 1**, Lemon teaches a system for enabling human users to interact with conversation-enabled applications installed at a remote location, said conversation-enabled applications implementing a conversation policy, the system comprising:

conversation support means (see page 2, [0023]: “a mechanism provides for a conversation controller”) communicating with a human-usable interface installed on a user device to support the user's side of a conversation with the conversation-enabled applications (see page 2, [0027]: “validate that each message is of an appropriate input document type for the current state of the conversation”);

presentation support means communicating with the human-usable interface installed on the user device to show the user a state of the conversation (see page 2, [0028]: “conversation history”) and options for selection by the user (see page 3, [0034]: “prompting the client for valid input documents”); and

data input means installed on the user device by which the user selects an available option and fills in message content that conforms with the conversation policy in use by the conversation-enabled applications (see page 2, [0026]: “may also invoke appropriate services and/or client entry points based on dispatch service description language specifications and prompt for valid input document types for a given state of a conversation”).

As per **claim 10**, Lemon teaches a method for enabling human users to interact with conversation-enabled applications installed at a remote location, said interaction being by means of a user device having an installed human-usable interface and said conversation-enabled applications implementing a conversation policy, the method comprising the steps of:

loading a selected service device, said service including a policy archive and a presentation archive (see page 5, [0056]: “may execute information... received from the

Internet or other networks” and [0057]: “these aspects of an implementation consistent with the present invention are described as being stored in memory... or read from other types”);

installing a conversation policy supporting the selected service (see page 2, [0023]: “a mechanism provides for a conversation controller”);

accessing the policy archive and communicating with the human-usable interface installed on the user device to support the user's side of a conversation with the conversation-enabled applications (see page 2, [0027]: “validate that each message is of an appropriate input document type for the current state of the conversation”);

accessing the presentation archive and communicating with the human-usable interface installed on the user device to show the user a state of the conversation (see page 2, [0028]: “conversation history”) and options for selection by the user (see page 3, [0034]: “prompting the client for valid input documents”); and

prompting user to select an available option and fill in message content that conforms with the conversation policy in use by the conversation-enabled applications (see page 2, [0026]: “may also invoke appropriate services and/or client entry points based on dispatch service description language specifications and prompt for valid input document types for a given state of a conversation”).

DEPENDENT:

As per **claim 2**, which depends on claim 1, Lemon further teaches wherein in the conversation support means and the presentation support means are installed on the user device (see Fig.6).

As per **claim 3**, which depends on claim 1, Lemon further teaches wherein the conversation support means and the presentation support means are installed on a remote machine, which communicates with the user device (see Fig.3).

As per **claim 5**, which depends on claim 1, Lemon further teaches wherein the data input means prompts the user for decisions (see page 4, [0052]: “prompts for next legal input document”) and then generates a corresponding screen flow for data input and transforms entered data into a format suitable for delivery to the remote location (see page 1, [0013]: “An embodiment of the mechanism may also apply a transformation to output documents”).

As per **claim 6**, which depends on claim 1, Lemon further teaches wherein, said presentation support means includes an archive of presentation policies accessed to render messages for the user (see page 2, [0028]: “current state, may need to be tracked”).

As per **claim 8**, which depends on claim 1, Lemon further teaches wherein the user device is a personal computer (see Fig.6).

As per **claim 9**, which depends on claim 1, Lemon further teaches wherein said presentation support is obtained from another system (see Fig.3).

As per **claim 11**, which depends on claim 10, Lemon further teaches wherein the policy archive and presentation archive are loaded on the user device and the conversation policy is installed on the user device (see claim 2 rejection above).

As per **claim 13**, which depends on claim 11, Lemon further teaches wherein the user device is a personal computer (see claim 8 rejection above).

As per **claim 14**, which depends on claim 10, Lemon further teaches wherein the policy archive and presentation archive are loaded on a remote machine and the conversation policy is installed on the remote machine, the remote machine communicating with the human-usable interface installed on the user device (see claim 3 rejection above).

As per **claim 15**, which depends on claim 10, Lemon further teaches wherein said presentation support is obtained from another system (see claim 9 rejection above).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4, 7, 12, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemon et al. (US 2002/0188666) in view of Bandhole et al. (US 2002/0059377).

As per **claim 4**, which depends on claim 1, Lemon does not explicitly teach wherein the human-usable interface is a plug-in browser.

Bandhole teaches that the human-usable interface is a plug-in browser (see page 4, [0043]: "plug-in").

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Lemon in view of Bandhole so that the human-usable interface is a plug-in browser. One would be motivated to do so because Lemon teaches that the client is a web browser (see page 2, [0027]) and further teaches that the conversation controller can be received from the Internet (see page 5, [0056]). One of ordinary skill in the art knows that plug-in's are employed from the Internet for enabling specific functional applications via the browser.

As per **claim 7**, which depends on claim 1, Lemon does not explicitly teach wherein the user device is a personal digital assistant.

Bandhole teaches that the user device is a personal digital assistant (see page 3, [0030] and page 4, [0041]: "PDA"). One would be motivated to do so because one of ordinary skill in the art know that advancements in technology are enabling personal computing functionalities to be employed in mobile devices such as a PDA, cell phones, laptops, and the like.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Lemon in view of Bandhole so that the user device is a personal digital assistant.

As per **claim 16**, which depends on claim 10, Bandhole teaches wherein the human-usable interface is a plug-in browser (see claim 4 rejection above).

As per **claim 12**, which depends on claim 11, Bandhole teaches wherein the user device is a personal digital assistant (see claim 7 rejection above).

Conclusion

6. For the reasons above, claims 1-16 have been rejected and remain pending.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Y. Won whose telephone number is 571-272-3993. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th: 7AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Won/

Primary Examiner

July 27, 2007